

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 MAURICE ANTIONE BRADSHAW

No. 2:02-cv-0588-MCE-CMK-P

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

ORDER

14 J. McGRATH, et al.,

15 Respondents.
16 _____/

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an
18 Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
19 § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
20 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General
21 Order No. 262.

22 On August 23, 2006, the magistrate judge filed Findings and
23 Recommendations herein which were served on Petitioner and which
24 contained notice to Petitioner that any Objections to the
25 Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within ten days.

26 ///

1 Petitioner subsequently requested and was granted an extension of
2 time to file objections. Petitioner has now filed Objections to
3 the Findings and Recommendations.

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.
5 § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this Court has conducted a
6 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
7 entire file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to
8 be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

10 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed August 23, 2006,
11 are adopted in full; and

12 2. Petitioner's Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is
13 denied.

14 DATED: October 12, 2006

15
16
17 

18 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26